Channel Diversity needed for Vector Interference Alignment

Cheuk Ting Li and Ayfer Özgür
Stanford University, California, USA
Email: ctli@stanford.edu, aozgur@stanford.edu

arXiv:1402.5326v1 [cs.IT] 21 Feb 2014

Abstract

In this paper, we consider vector space interference alignment strategies over the K-user interference channel and derive an upper bound on the achievable degrees of freedom as a function of the channel diversity L. The channel diversity L is modeled by L independently fading real-valued parallel channels. Existing results in the literature for $K = 3$ show that the optimal $1/2$ degrees of freedom per user can be approached at the speed of $1/L$ (i.e. the gap to $1/2$ degrees of freedom per user decreases inversely proportional to L). In this paper, we show that when $K \geq 4$, the speed of convergence is significantly slower. In particular, the gap to $1/2$ degrees of freedom per user can decrease at most like $1/\sqrt{L}$. Furthermore when K is of the order of $\sqrt{\log L}$, we show that the speed of convergence is smaller than $1/\sqrt[4]{L}$.

I. Introduction

Interference is the central phenomenon severely limiting the performance of most wireless systems. Over the recent years, interference alignment has emerged as a promising tool to mitigate interference [1], [2]. The main idea is to design transmit signals of different users in such a way that, upon arriving at the unintended receivers, they overlap with each other and the resulting interference is perceived as much less than the sum of the individual interferences. Surprisingly, the work [2] of Cadambe and Jafar has shown that this approach can lead to $K/2$ degrees of freedom over the time or frequency-varying K-user interference channel, while traditional approaches such as treating interference as noise or orthogonalizing transmissions can provide only one degree of freedom. This roughly implies that at high-SNR each user can communicate as if it has half the resources of the channel for its exclusive use, independent of the total number of users K.

However, one of the main caveats of the $K/2$ degrees of freedom result in [2] is that the time or frequency variation needed is unbounded. More precisely, the number of independent channel realizations needed (in the form of parallel channels) has to grow as K^{K^2} with increasing number of users K (this scaling can be slightly improved to 2^{K^2} [3]). In practice wireless channels have finite channel diversity (dictated by the coherence time and bandwidth of the channel) and the requirement K^{K^2} is prohibitive even for small values of K. Understanding whether this exponential requirement for channel diversity is fundamentally needed for vector interference alignment strategies (of which the scheme in [2] is one specific example) remains as an important problem in determining the promise of such strategies in practical wireless systems.

Despite significant in interference alignment techniques over the recent years, there is little understanding of how the available channel diversity impacts the ability to align interference. To the best of our knowledge, the only work that sheds light on this question is the work of Bresler et al [4], which characterizes the relation between the available channel diversity (number of independent channel realizations) L and the total degrees of freedom achievable using vector alignment schemes for the three user interference channel (their result subsumes an earlier result in [5] which corresponds to the case $L = 2$). They show that the achievable degrees of freedom in the 3-user interference channel are given by

$$\mathrm{DoF} = \frac{3}{2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{4L - 2\lfloor L/2 \rfloor - 1}\right).$$

We can observe that when $L \to \infty$, $3/2$ degrees of freedom are achievable as expected, and for finite values of L the formula precisely characterizes how DoF approaches $3/2$ as a function of L. To best of our knowledge, nothing is known regarding the relation between channel diversity and achievable degrees of freedom for interference channels with more than 3-users; apart from the trivial conclusion that when $L = 1$, vector interference alignment can achieve only one degree of freedom and the result of [2] which shows that when $L \to \infty$, $K/2$ degrees of freedom are achievable.

In this paper, we make progress in this direction by first showing that for $K \geq 4$,

$$\mathrm{DoF} \leq \frac{K}{2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{11\sqrt{L}}\right).$$

Cheuk Ting Li is supported by a Stanford Graduate Fellowship.

This result shows that the degrees of freedom per user approach $1/2$ much slower when $K \geq 4$ when compared to $K = 3$; the gap decreases as $1/\sqrt{L}$ as opposed to $1/L$. Next, we further improve our result to

$$\mathrm{DoF} \leq \frac{K}{2}\left(1 - C\min\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{L}}, \frac{2^{(K-2)(K-3)/8}}{\sqrt{L}}\right\}\right),$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant, which implies that the gap decreases as $1/\sqrt[4]{L}$ in the regime where K is larger than the order of $\sqrt{\log L}$.

A closer look to the scheme in [2] reveals that the following degrees of freedom are achievable over the K-user interference channel for L large enough.

$$\mathrm{DoF} \geq \frac{K}{2}\left(1 - \frac{CN}{\sqrt[N]{L/2}}\right),$$

where $N = (K-1)(K-2) - 1$ and $C > 0$ is a constant. We indeed believe that this lower bound is tight in terms of scaling with respect to L. The proof remains an open problem.

A related line of research [6], [7], [8], [9] looks at the relation between the spatial diversity and the degrees of freedom achievable over a MIMO interference channel. Here each user is equipped with multiple antennas and signals are aligned over the spatial dimension with no time/frequency diversity. The impact of the spatial diversity on the achievable degrees of freedom with vector interference alignment strategies is much better understood. For example, [10] shows that in the symmetric case where each node is equipped with N antennas, the maximum number of DoF achievable with vector space alignment strategies is given by

$$\mathrm{DoF} = K\left\lfloor\frac{2N}{K+1}\right\rfloor \leq 2N\frac{K}{K+1}.$$

In sharp contrast to the $K/2$ degrees of freedom achievable with time/frequency diversity, this result implies that the DoF gain from aligning interference over the spatial dimension is limited by a factor of 2 when compared to the DoF achieved by simply orthogonalizing transmissions between different users. In other words, the gain from spatial interference alignment is very limited when compared to the potential gain from aligning interference over time/frequency varying channels. Therefore, understanding the feasibility of interference alignment over time/frequency varying channels with limited diversity is even more critical.

II. Problem Formulation

A. Notation

For a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^L$, we write $\|\mathbf{v}\|_0$ for the number of nonzero entries of $\mathbf{v}$. For subspaces $V_1, V_2, ..., V_n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^L$, we write $V_1 + V_2 = \mathrm{span}\,(V_1 \cup V_2)$, and $\sum_{i=1}^n V_i = V_1 + \cdots + V_n$. We write $\langle \mathbf{v}_1, ..., \mathbf{v}_n\rangle = \mathrm{span}\,\{\mathbf{v}_1, ..., \mathbf{v}_n\}$. For a subset $S \subseteq \{1, ..., L\}$, $\mathbb{R}^S = \mathrm{span}\bigcup_{s\in S}\mathbf{e}_s \subseteq \mathbb{R}^L$, where $\mathbf{e}_s$ is the s-th standard basis vector of $\mathbb{R}^L$ ($\mathbb{R}^S$ is the subspace where all entries other than those in S are zeros).

B. Channel Model

Consider the fully-connected K-user Gaussian interference channel, where receiver i wants to obtain a message from transmitter i for $1 \leq i \leq K$, but the signal received is superimposed by interferences from transmitters $j \neq i$. The input-output relationship is given by

$$\mathbf{y}_i = \sum_{j=1}^K \mathbf{H}_{ij}\mathbf{x}_j + \mathbf{z}_i,$$

where $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^L$ is the transmitted signal of transmitter i over L channel uses, $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^L$ is the received signal of receiver i, $\mathbf{z}_i \sim \mathbb{R}\mathcal{N}(0, I)$ is an additive white Gaussian noise, and $\mathbf{H}_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{L\times L}$ is a diagonal matrix containing the channel coefficients from Transmitter j to Receiver i over the L channel uses,

$$\mathbf{H}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} h_{ij}^{(1)} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & h_{ij}^{(L)} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We assume the entries of $\mathbf{H}_{ij}$ are chosen i.i.d. from a continuous distribution, or more generally, the joint distribution of $\{(\mathbf{H}_{ij})_{\ell\ell}\}_{i,j=1,...,K,\,\ell=1,...,L}$ has a density in the LK^2-dimensional space. This channel model corresponds to L uses of a fast fading interference channel where we get a different realization of the channel at each use.

The integer L is called the *diversity* of the channel. In the above model it corresponds to the blocklength of communication. More generally, it is the number of coherence periods over which we code. The result in this paper can be extended to the block fading case where each coherence period is of duration T. In this case, the matrices $\mathbf{H}_{ij}$ are formed by placing T copies of $\mathrm{diag}[h_{ij}^{(1)}, ..., h_{ij}^{(L)}]$ diagonally.

C. Vector Interference Alignment Strategies and Degrees of Freedom

In this paper we focus on vector space schemes, which we specify next. Suppose transmitter i wishes to transmit $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i \in \mathbb{R}^D$ containing D data symbols. It applies a precoding matrix $\mathbf{V}_i$ and transmits $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{V}_i \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i$. Let $V_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^L$ be the column span of $\mathbf{V}_i$. Receiver i decodes $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i$ by zero-forcing interference, i.e. projecting its received signal on the orthogonal complement of the space spanned by the interference. At high SNR, it can decode the D data symbols if the signal subspace $\mathbf{H}_{ii}V_i$ is disjoint from the interference subspace, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{H}_{ii}V_i \cap \left(\sum_{j\neq i} \mathbf{H}_{ij}V_j\right) = \{0\}.$$

We call this the *decoding condition* at receiver i. The maximum total degrees of freedom achievable by this strategy is given by

$$\mathrm{DoF} = \max_{\{V_i\} \text{ satisfies decoding condition } \forall i} KD/L.$$

It can be can be shown that this corresponds to the classical degrees of freedom definition in terms of an appropriate high-SNR limit.

If we wish to have $\mathrm{DoF} \geq (1-\epsilon)K/2$, then $D \geq (1-\epsilon)L/2$. The goal of this paper is to give a lower bound on the channel diversity L in terms of the gap ϵ to the maximal achievable degrees of freedom $K/2$.

In the block fading case, the signal space would be $V_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{TL}$ instead of $V_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^L$, and therefore the definition of maximum total degrees of freedom would be modified as

$$\mathrm{DoF} = \max_{\{V_i\} \text{ satisfies decoding condition } \forall i} \frac{KD}{TL}.$$

III. Main Result

The following theorem is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1. *In the fast fading case ($T = 1$), when $K \geq 4$, with probability 1, the maximum sum degrees of freedom achievable with vector space interference alignment strategies is bounded by*

$$\mathrm{DoF} \leq \frac{K}{2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{11\sqrt{L}}\right).$$

The theorem can be extended to block fading, at the expense of a larger constant.

Theorem 2. *In the block fading case for any value of $T \geq 1$, when $K \geq 4$, with probability 1, the maximum sum degrees of freedom achievable with vector space interference alignment strategies is bounded by*

$$\mathrm{DoF} \leq \frac{K}{2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{20\sqrt{L}}\right).$$

The result can be improved for large L and K to the following result.

Theorem 3. *In the fast fading or block fading case for any value of $T \geq 1$, when $K \geq 4$, with probability 1, the maximum total degrees of freedom is bounded by*

$$\mathrm{DoF} \leq \frac{K}{2}\left(1 - C\min\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{L}}, \frac{2^{(K-2)(K-3)/8}}{\sqrt{L}}\right\}\right),$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant.

The rest of the paper is devoted to the proof of the theorems. In Section IV, we define and develop three notions: the alignment width of a subspace, the sparsity of a subspace, and the linear independence condition for a set of diagonal matrices which allow us to convert the problem of interest to a purely linear algebra problem. In Section V, we provide the intuition for our proof under a simplifying assumption. The proof of our main result for fast fading (Theorem 1) is given in Section VI, and for block fading (Theorem 2) in Section VII. Theorem 3 is proved in Section VIII.

IV. A Linear Algebra problem

Below, we focus on the case $K \geq 4$. We assume that the diagonal entries of $\mathbf{H}_{ij}$ are nonzero, which holds with probability 1.

A. Alignment Width

Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^L$ be a subspace, and $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{R}^{L\times L}$ be a diagonal matrix. Define the extension operator $\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}}$ and the contraction operator $\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}}V &= V+\mathbf{T}V,\\ \mathrm{e}^n_{\mathbf{T}}V &= V+\mathbf{T}V+\cdots+\mathbf{T}^nV,\\ \mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}}V &= V\cap\mathbf{T}V,\\ \mathrm{c}^n_{\mathbf{T}}V &= V\cap\mathbf{T}V\cap\cdots\cap\mathbf{T}^nV.\end{aligned}$$

Definition 4. (Alignment width) We define the alignment width of a subspace V with respect to a diagonal matrix $\mathbf{T}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{\mathbf{T}}V &= \dim\left(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}}V\right)-\dim V\\ &= \dim V-\dim\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}}V\right).\end{aligned}$$

Now, define

$$\mathbf{T}_{ijk}=\mathbf{H}_{1i}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{1k}\mathbf{H}_{jk}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{ji}.$$

We will show that if the subspaces V_i satisfy the decoding condition, then they have to "align" with these diagonal matrices $\mathbf{T}_{ijk}$ in the sense that V_i has a large intersection with $\mathbf{T}_{ijk}V_i$, i.e., $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_{ijk}}V_i$ is small.

Lemma 5 (Width requirement for decoding)**.** *If $D=(1-\epsilon)L/2$ and V_i, $i=1,\ldots,K$ satisfy the decoding condition at all the receivers, then $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_{ijk}}V_i\le 2\epsilon L$ for all distinct $i,j,k\neq 1$.*

Proof: Due to the decoding condition at receiver 1, for any distinct $i,k\neq 1$ we have

$$\dim\left(\mathbf{H}_{1i}V_i+\mathbf{H}_{1k}V_k\right)=\dim\left(V_i+\mathbf{H}_{1i}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{1k}V_k\right)\le(1+\epsilon)L/2.$$

Due to the decoding condition at receiver $j\neq 1$, we have

$$\dim\left(\mathbf{H}_{ji}V_i+\mathbf{H}_{jk}V_k\right)=\dim\left(\mathbf{T}_{ijk}V_i+\mathbf{H}_{1i}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{1k}V_k\right)\le(1+\epsilon)L/2.$$

for any distinct i,j,k. Let $\hat{V}_k=\mathbf{H}_{1i}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{1k}V_k$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\dim\left(V_i\cap\hat{V}_k\right)\\ &=\dim\left(V_i\right)+\dim\left(\hat{V}_k\right)-\dim\left(V_i+\hat{V}_k\right)\\ &\ge 2D-(1+\epsilon)L/2,\end{aligned}$$

and similarly we have $\dim\left(\mathbf{T}_{ijk}V_i\cap\hat{V}_k\right)\ge 2D-(1+\epsilon)L/2$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}&\dim\left(V_i\cap\mathbf{T}_{ijk}V_i\right)\\ &\ge \dim\left(V_i\cap\mathbf{T}_{ijk}V_i\cap\hat{V}_k\right)\\ &= \dim\left(V_i\cap\hat{V}_k\right)+\dim\left(\mathbf{T}_{ijk}V_i\cap\hat{V}_k\right)\\ &\quad-\dim\left(\left(V_i+\mathbf{T}_{ijk}V_i\right)\cap\hat{V}_k\right)\\ &\ge 3D-(1+\epsilon)L\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_{ijk}}V_i=D-\dim\left(V_i\cap\mathbf{T}_{ijk}V_i\right)\le D-\left(3D-(1+\epsilon)L\right)=2\epsilon L,$$

which completes the proof of the lemma. ∎

B. Sparsity of Subspaces

In this section, we define the sparsity of a subspace and show that if V_i satisfy the decoding condition then they cannot have low sparsity.

Definition 6. (N-sparsity) We define the *N-sparsity* of a subspace $V\subseteq\mathbb{R}^L$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{sp}_N\left(V\right)&=\min\left\{|S|\,:\,S\subseteq\{1,...,L\},\,\dim\left(V\cap\mathbb{R}^S\right)\ge N\right\}\\ &=\min\left\{\max_{\mathbf{v}\in W}\|\mathbf{v}\|_0\,:\,W\subseteq V,\,\dim\left(W\right)\ge N\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

When $N > \dim V$, let $\mathrm{sp}_N(V) = \infty$.

If $\mathrm{sp}_N(V) = d$, this says two things of importance: first in all subspaces of V of dimension equal to (or larger than) N, we can find at least one vector with d non-zero entries; second, V has a subspace W of dimension N such that $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^S$ for some S with $|S| = d$. (This immediately implies that $\mathrm{sp}_N(V) \geq N$.) It is easy to observe that the two definitions are equivalent.

Lemma 7 (Sparsity requirement for decoding)**.** *If $D = (1-\epsilon)L/2$ and V_i, $i = 1, \ldots, K$ satisfy the decoding condition at all the receivers, then $\mathrm{sp}_N(V_i) \geq 2N - \epsilon L$ for all i and $N = 1, ..., D$.*

Proof: Assume the contrary that for one of the subspaces V_i, $\mathrm{sp}_N(V_i) < 2N - \epsilon L$ for some $N = 1, ..., D$. This implies that there exists $S \subseteq \{1, ..., L\}$ such that $|S| < 2N - \epsilon L$ and $\dim\left(V_i \cap \mathbb{R}^S\right) \geq N$, or equivalently $2\dim\left(V_i \cap \mathbb{R}^S\right) - |S| > \epsilon L$. Consider the signal space at receiver i, which is $\mathbf{H}_{ii}V_i$, and the interference space from transmitter 1 (assume i is not 1 or 2), which is $\mathbf{H}_{i1}V_1$. From the decoding condition at receiver i, we have $\mathbf{H}_{ii}V_i \cap \mathbf{H}_{i1}V_1 = \emptyset$, or equivalently $V_1 \cap \mathbf{H}_{i1}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{ii}V_i = \emptyset$. Note that $\dim\left(\left(\mathbf{H}_{i1}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{ii}V_i\right) \cap \mathbb{R}^S\right) = \dim\left(V_i \cap \mathbb{R}^S\right) > (|S| + \epsilon L)/2$, and since $V_1 \cap \mathbf{H}_{i1}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{ii}V_i = \emptyset$, we have $\dim\left(V_1 \cap \mathbb{R}^S\right) < |S| - (|S| + \epsilon L)/2 = (|S| - \epsilon L)/2$.

Consider the interference at receiver 2, we have $\dim\left(\mathbf{H}_{21}V_1 + \mathbf{H}_{2i}V_i\right) = \dim\left(V_1 + \mathbf{H}_{21}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{2i}V_i\right) \leq (1+\epsilon)L/2$, but

$$\begin{aligned}
&\dim\left(V_1 + \mathbf{H}_{21}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{2i}V_i\right) \\
&\geq \dim\left(V_1 + \left(\left(\mathbf{H}_{21}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{2i}V_i\right) \cap \mathbb{R}^S\right)\right) \\
&> D + (|S| + \epsilon L)/2 - \dim\left(V_1 \cap \left(\left(\mathbf{H}_{21}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{2i}V_i\right) \cap \mathbb{R}^S\right)\right) \\
&> (1-\epsilon)L/2 + (|S| + \epsilon L)/2 - (|S| - \epsilon L)/2 \\
&= (1+\epsilon)L/2,
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to a contradiction. ∎

C. Linear Independence Condition

Next, we state a property of the matrices $\mathbf{T}_{ijk}$, which we need in order to prove our main result.

Definition 8 (Linear independence condition)**.** We call a set of diagonal matrices $\{\mathbf{T}_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,M} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{L\times L}$ with nonzero diagonal entries satisfies the *linear independence condition* if for any set of integer vectors $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^M$, and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^L$ with $\|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \geq |A|$, the set of vectors

$$\left\{\prod_{i=1}^{M} \mathbf{T}_i^{x_i}\mathbf{v} \,:\, \mathbf{x} = [x_1, ..., x_M]^T \in A\right\}$$

is linearly independent.

Almost all of the sets of diagonal matrices satisfy the linear independence condition, as shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 9. *Let $\mathbf{T}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{L\times L}$ ($i = 1, ..., M$, $M \geq 2$) be diagonal matrices. Consider the LM-dimensional space containing all such $\{\mathbf{T}_i\}$ with the Lebesgue measure. Then $\{\mathbf{T}_i\}$ satisfies the linear independence condition almost everywhere.*

Proof: Fix any $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^M$. It suffices to consider all entries of $\mathbf{v}$ to be nonzero and $|A| = L$. Write $\Phi(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^{M} \mathbf{T}_i^{x_i}$. To show $\{\Phi(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{v} \,:\, \mathbf{x} \in A\}$ is linearly independent for any $\mathbf{v}$ with nonzero entries, since $\Phi(\mathbf{x})$ are diagonal matrices, it suffices to show that $\{\mathrm{diag}(\Phi(\mathbf{x})) \,:\, \mathbf{x} \in A\}$ (the vector formed by diagonal entries) are linearly independent.

Let $A = \{\mathbf{x}_1, ..., \mathbf{x}_L\}$, $\mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{T}_i) = [t_{i1} \cdots t_{iL}]^T$. Note that $\det\left[\mathrm{diag}(\Phi(\mathbf{x}_1)) \cdots \mathrm{diag}(\Phi(\mathbf{x}_L))\right]$ is a polynomial (possibly with negative exponents) in $\{t_{i\ell}\}_{i=1,\ldots,M,\,\ell=1,\ldots,L}$. The determinant is zero in a set of nonzero measure only if it is constantly zero.

Assume the contrary that the determinant is zero in a set of nonzero measure, then it is zero for any $\{t_{i\ell}\}$. Let $y_1, ..., y_L \in \mathbb{R}$. Put $t_{i\ell} = y_\ell^{\rho_i}$ for certain $\rho_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{M} \rho_i x_{ki}$ are distinct for different k, where $\mathbf{x}_k = [x_{k1}, ..., x_{kM}]^T$. Then the determinant is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\det\begin{bmatrix} \prod_{i=1}^{M} t_{i1}^{x_{1i}} & \cdots & \prod_{i=1}^{M} t_{i1}^{x_{Li}} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \prod_{i=1}^{M} t_{iL}^{x_{1i}} & \cdots & \prod_{i=1}^{M} t_{iL}^{x_{Li}} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \det\begin{bmatrix} y_1^{\sum_{i=1}^{M}\rho_i x_{1i}} & \cdots & y_1^{\sum_{i=1}^{M}\rho_i x_{1i}} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ y_L^{\sum_{i=1}^{M}\rho_i x_{1i}} & \cdots & y_L^{\sum_{i=1}^{M}\rho_i x_{1i}} \end{bmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

is the product of a Vandermonde polynomial and a Schur polynomial in $y_1, ..., y_L$, and is not constantly zero, which can be shown easily by induction. Therefore the determinant is nonzero almost everywhere.

To argue that the claim holds for any $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^M$ almost everywhere, note that the number of subsets of $\mathbb{Z}^M$ of size not greater than L is countable. The set of $\{t_i\}$ that there exist an A such that the claim is false can be obtained as the union of countably many sets of measure zero, and thus is of measure zero. ■

D. The Linear Algebra Problem

Let us focus on one of the subspaces, say $V = V_2$ of transmitter 2. For notational simplicity, we write the set

$$\{\mathbf{T}_{2jk} \,:\, j,k \in \{3,...,K\}\,,\, j \neq k\} \qquad \text{as} \qquad \{\mathbf{T}_a\}_{a=1,...,M}\,,$$

where $M = (K-2)(K-3)$. Note that each $\mathbf{T}_a$ involves one term $\mathbf{H}_{jk}^{-1}$ which is absent in the definition of other $\mathbf{T}_a$'s, therefore when we consider the LM-dimensional space of the diagonal entries of $\{\mathbf{T}_a\}_{a=1,...,M}$, the distribution in that space has a joint probability density. Therefore by Lemma 9, we know that the set $\{\mathbf{T}_a\}_{a=1,...,M}$ satisfies the linear independence condition with probability 1.

In the earlier sections, we have shown that if we want to approach the maximal degrees of freedom per user by ϵ, then the decoding conditions at the receivers imply a lower bound on the sparsity of V and an upper bound on its alignment width with respect to $\{\mathbf{T}_a\}_{a=1,...,M}$ in terms of ϵ. Thus, we have transformed the problem into the following linear algebra problem:

Let $\{\mathbf{T}_a\}_{a=1,...,M}$ be diagonal matrices which satisfy the linear independence condition. Assume $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^L$ with $\dim V = D = (1-\epsilon)L/2$ satisfies $\mathrm{sp}_N(V) \geq 2N - \epsilon L$ for all $N = 1,...,D$, and $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_a} V \leq 2\epsilon L$ for all a. We would like to give a lower bound on L in terms of ϵ.

V. Intuition of the Proof

We first prove a lemma regarding the alignment width.

Lemma 10. *For any diagonal matrix* $\mathbf{T}$ *and subspace* V*,*

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}} V)\,,\, \Delta_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}} V) \leq \Delta_{\mathbf{T}} V.$$

Proof: Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}} V) - \Delta_{\mathbf{T}} V \\
&= \dim\left(\mathbf{T}^2 V + \mathbf{T}V + V\right) - 2\dim(\mathbf{T}V + V) + \dim V \\
&= \dim\left(\mathbf{T}^2 V + \mathbf{T}V\right) + \dim(\mathbf{T}V + V) \\
&\quad - \dim\left(\left(\mathbf{T}^2 V + \mathbf{T}V\right) \cap (\mathbf{T}V + V)\right) \\
&\quad - 2\dim(\mathbf{T}V + V) + \dim V \\
&= \dim V - \dim\left(\left(\mathbf{T}^2 V + \mathbf{T}V\right) \cap (\mathbf{T}V + V)\right) \leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from $\dim\left(\left(\mathbf{T}^2 V + \mathbf{T}V\right) \cap (\mathbf{T}V + V)\right) \geq \dim(\mathbf{T}V) = \dim V$ A similar result holds for $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}} V)$. ■

When $K \geq 4$, we have at least two matrices $\mathbf{T}_1$ and $\mathbf{T}_2$, and we will use only these two matrices to prove Theorem 1. The idea of the proof is to find a vector $\mathbf{v}$ and integers n_1, n_2 which are large when ϵ is small such that the space

$$\begin{aligned}
W &= \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2} \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} \langle \mathbf{v} \rangle \\
&= \mathrm{span}\left\{\mathbf{T}_2^{\alpha_2} \mathbf{T}_1^{\alpha_1} \mathbf{v} \,:\, 0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq n_1, 0 \leq \alpha_2 \leq n_2\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

is a proper subspace of $\mathbb{R}^L$. By the linear independence condition of $\mathbf{T}_1$ and $\mathbf{T}_2$, we can then have $(n_1+1)(n_2+1) < L$ which will allow to obtain a lower bound bound for L in terms of epsilon. We can think of W as the span of the "grid points" in the rectangle $\{0,...,n_1\} \times \{0,...,n_2\}$.

We will first find a long "line" $\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} \langle \mathbf{v} \rangle$ which is a subspace of V. Note that if we perform a contraction in $\mathbf{T}_1$ direction, the resultant subspace $\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_1} V$, compared to V, will have dimension reduced by $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V$. If we perform a second contraction, by Lemma 10, the resultant subspace $\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^2 V$, will have dimension reduced by at most $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V$ as compared to $\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_1} V$, therefore at most $2\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V$ as compared to V. Following in this manner, this means that as long as $n_1 \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V < \dim V$, the resultant subspace $\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} V$ after we perform n_1 contractions will still be nonempty. Hence we can find

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} V = V \cap \mathbf{T}_1 V \cap \cdots \cap \mathbf{T}_1^{n_1} V.$$

This means $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \mathbf{T}_1^{-1}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, ..., \mathbf{T}_1^{-n_1}\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in V$. Let $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{T}_1^{-n_1}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$, then $\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} \langle \mathbf{v} \rangle \subseteq V$.

Next we find n_2. Again we know the dimension of $\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2} V$ is larger by $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V$ as compared to V, and moreover by Lemma 10 if we perform multiple extensions the dimension of the resultant subspace increases by at most $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V$ at each step. Hence, as long as $n_2 \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V < L - \dim V$, we can perform n_2 extensions and the resultant subspace $\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2} V$ will still be a proper subspace of $\mathbb{R}^L$. Since $W = \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_1} \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_2} \langle \mathbf{v} \rangle \subseteq \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2} V$, W is also a proper subspace of $\mathbb{R}^L$.

We finally use the linear independence condition for $\mathbf{T}_1$ and $\mathbf{T}_2$ to conclude that for any n_1 and n_2 such that $n_1\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1}V < \dim V$ and $n_2\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2}V < L - \dim V$, $(n_1+1)(n_2+1) < L$. Now, since $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2}V, \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1}V \leq 2\epsilon L$ and $\dim V = (1-\epsilon)L/2$, we can take any n_1 and n_2 such that

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &< \dim V/\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1}V = (1-\epsilon)/4\epsilon \approx 1/4\epsilon, \\ n_2 &< (L - \dim V)/\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2}V = (1+\epsilon)/4\epsilon \approx 1/4\epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which gives the lower bound $L \gtrapprox \epsilon^{-2}/16$.

A few details are missing in this proof intuition. For example, the entries of $\mathbf{v}$ may be zero, so $\dim W$ may be smaller than $(n_1+1)(n_2+1)$. This is where the sparsity requirement is needed. A rigorous proof is given in the next section.

VI. Lower Bound on Channel Diversity

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 1, which is implied by the following theorem.

Theorem 11. *Let $\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{L\times L}$ satisfy the linear independence condition. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Assume there exist vector subspace $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^L$ with $\dim V = D = (1-\epsilon)L/2$ satisfying $\mathrm{sp}_N(V) \geq 2N - \epsilon L$ for any $N = 1, ..., D$, and $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1}V, \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2}V \leq 2\epsilon L$, then we have $L \geq \epsilon^{-2}/121$.*

Proof: Note that for any $n_1 \geq 0$, by Lemma 10,

$$\dim \mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} V \geq \dim V - n_1\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1}V.$$

Substitute $n_1 = \left\lfloor \frac{D-N}{\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1}V} \right\rfloor$ for some N, we have $\dim \mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} V \geq N$, and therefore since $\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} V \subseteq V$, by the definition of sparsity for V, we can find $\|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \geq \mathrm{sp}_N(V)$ such that $\mathbf{T}_1^{-n_1}\mathbf{v} \in \mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} V$, and hence $\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1}\langle\mathbf{v}\rangle \subseteq V$.

On the other hand, for any $n_2 \geq 0$, by Lemma 10,

$$\dim \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2} V \leq \dim V + n_2\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2}V.$$

Substitute $n_2 = \left\lfloor \frac{\mathrm{sp}_N(V)-1-D}{\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2}V} \right\rfloor$, we have $\dim \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2} V \leq \mathrm{sp}_N(V)-1$. Since $\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2}\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1}\langle\mathbf{v}\rangle \subseteq \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2} V$, we also have $\dim \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2}\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1}\langle\mathbf{v}\rangle \leq \mathrm{sp}_N(V) - 1$.

Note that by the linear independence condition

$$\begin{aligned} &\dim \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1}\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2}\langle\mathbf{v}\rangle \\ &= \dim \mathrm{span}\left\{\mathbf{T}_1^{\alpha_1}\mathbf{T}_2^{\alpha_2}\mathbf{v} \,:\, 0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq n_1, 0 \leq \alpha_2 \leq n_2\right\} \\ &= \min\left\{(n_1+1)(n_2+1), \|\mathbf{v}\|_0\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \geq \mathrm{sp}_N(V)$, $\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2}\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1}\langle\mathbf{v}\rangle = (n_1+1)(n_2+1)$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{sp}_N(V) - 1 &\geq (n_1+1)(n_2+1) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{D-N}{\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1}V}\right)\left(\frac{\mathrm{sp}_N(V)-D}{\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2}V}\right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1}V \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2}V &\geq \frac{(D-N)(\mathrm{sp}_N(V)-D)}{\mathrm{sp}_N(V)-1} \\ &\geq \frac{(D-N)(\mathrm{sp}_N(V)-D)}{\mathrm{sp}_N(V)}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $D = (1-\epsilon)L/2$. Substitute $N = \left\lceil \frac{3+\epsilon}{8}L \right\rceil$. Note that $\mathrm{sp}_N(V_i) \geq 2N - \epsilon L \geq \frac{3}{2}D$.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1}V \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2}V &\geq \frac{(D-N)(\mathrm{sp}_N(V)-D)}{\mathrm{sp}_N(V)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}L - \frac{3+\epsilon}{8}L - 1\right) \\ &= \frac{1-5\epsilon}{24}L - \frac{1}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $2D = (1-\epsilon)L < L$, since both sides are integers, $2D \leq L-1$, $L\epsilon \geq 1$. If $\epsilon \geq 1/121$, then $L \geq \epsilon^{-1} \geq \frac{1}{121\epsilon^2}$.

If $\epsilon < 1/121$, then $L \geq \epsilon^{-1} > 121$, $L \geq 122$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V &\geq \frac{1-5\epsilon}{24} L - \frac{1}{3} \\ &\geq \frac{1-5\epsilon}{24} L - \frac{L}{366} \\ &= \frac{57-305\epsilon}{1464} L \\ &\geq \frac{57-305/121}{1464} L \\ &= \frac{824}{22143} L.\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_i}(V) \leq 2\epsilon L$. Hence

$$4\epsilon^2 L^2 \geq \frac{824}{22143} L, \quad L \geq \frac{206}{22143\epsilon^2} \geq \frac{1}{121\epsilon^2}.$$

■

VII. Generalization to Block Fading

In this section, we would consider the block fading case, where the channel coefficients are constant over coherence periods of duration T, i.e., $\mathbf{H}_{ij} = \mathbf{I}_T \otimes \operatorname{diag}\left[h_{ij}^{(1)}, ..., h_{ij}^{(L)}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{TL \times TL}$, where $\otimes$ denotes the Kronecker product.

Define $\mathbf{P}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times TL}$, $(\mathbf{P}_k)_{ij} = 1$ when $j = L(i-1) + k$, $(\mathbf{P}_k)_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Note that $\mathbf{P}_k$ is the projection which selects the entries of a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{TL}$ that are in the k-th coherence period.

Note that we have the same width requirement, i.e. $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_i} V \leq 2\epsilon TL$. We would modify the definition of sparsity for $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{TL}$ by

$$\operatorname{sp}_T(V) = \sum_{k=1}^{L} \dim(\mathbf{P}_k V),$$

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{sp}_{T,N}(V) &= \min\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{L} \dim \tilde{W}_k \,:\, \tilde{W}_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}^T, \dim\left(V \cap \sum_{k=1}^{L} \mathbf{P}_k^T \tilde{W}_k\right) \geq N\right\} \\ &= \min\left\{\operatorname{sp}_T(W) \,:\, W \subseteq V, \dim(W) \geq N\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

We can see that

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{sp}_{T,N}(\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}} V) &\geq \operatorname{sp}_{T,N}(V), \\ \operatorname{sp}_{T,N+\Delta_{\mathbf{T}} V}(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}} V) &\geq \operatorname{sp}_{T,N}(V).\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The corresponding sparsity requirement is described in the following lemma.

Lemma 12 (Sparsity requirement for decoding)**.** *If $D = (1-\epsilon)TL/2$ and V_i, $i = 1, \ldots, K$ satisfy the decoding condition at all the receivers, then $\operatorname{sp}_{T,N}(V_i) \geq 2N - \epsilon TL$ for all i and $N = 1, ..., D$.*

Proof: Assume the contrary that $\operatorname{sp}_{T,N}(V_i) < 2N - \epsilon TL$ for some $N = 1, ..., D$. This implies that there exists $\tilde{W}_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}^T$, $W = \sum_{k=1}^{L} \mathbf{P}_k^T \tilde{W}_k$ such that $\dim W < 2N - \epsilon TL$ and $\dim(V_i \cap W) \geq N$, or equivalently $2\dim(V_i \cap W) - \dim W > \epsilon TL$. Consider the signal at receiver i, which is $\mathbf{H}_{ii} V_i$, and the interference from transmitter 1 (assume i is not 1 or 2), which is $\mathbf{H}_{i1} V_1$. From the decoding condition at receiver i, we have $\mathbf{H}_{ii} V_i \cap \mathbf{H}_{i1} V_1 = \emptyset$, $V_1 \cap \mathbf{H}_{i1}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{ii} V_i = \emptyset$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{H}_{ij} W &= \sum_{k=1}^{L} \mathbf{H}_{ij} \mathbf{P}_k^T \tilde{W}_k \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{L} \left((\mathbf{H}_{ij})_{kk} \mathbf{I}\right) \mathbf{P}_k^T \tilde{W}_k \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{L} \mathbf{P}_k^T \tilde{W}_k \\ &= W,\end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\dim\left(\left(\mathbf{H}_{i1}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{ii}V_i\right)\cap W\right) &= \dim\left(V_i\cap\left(\mathbf{H}_{i1}\mathbf{H}_{ii}^{-1}W\right)\right)\\ &= \dim\left(V_i\cap W\right)\\ &> \left(\dim W+\epsilon TL\right)/2.\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with $V_1\cap\mathbf{H}_{i1}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{ii}V_i=\emptyset$, we have $\dim\left(V_1\cap W\right)<\left(\dim W-\epsilon TL\right)/2$.

Consider the interference at receiver 2, we have $\dim\left(\mathbf{H}_{21}V_1+\mathbf{H}_{2i}V_i\right)=\dim\left(V_1+\mathbf{H}_{21}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{2i}V_i\right)\leq\left(1+\epsilon\right)TL/2$, but

$$\begin{aligned}&\dim\left(V_1+\mathbf{H}_{21}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{2i}V_i\right)\\ &\geq\ \dim\left(V_1+\left(\left(\mathbf{H}_{21}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{2i}V_i\right)\cap W\right)\right)\\ &>\ D+\left(\dim W+\epsilon TL\right)/2-\dim\left(V_1\cap\left(\left(\mathbf{H}_{21}^{-1}\mathbf{H}_{2i}V_i\right)\cap W\right)\right)\\ &>\ \left(1-\epsilon\right)TL/2+\left(\dim W+\epsilon TL\right)/2-\left(\dim W-\epsilon TL\right)/2\\ &=\ \left(1+\epsilon\right)TL/2,\end{aligned}$$

which leads to a contradiction. ■

We would define the block linear independence condition.

Definition 13. We call a set of diagonal matrices $\{\mathbf{T}_i\}_{i=1,...,M}\subseteq\mathbb{R}^{TL\times TL}$ with nonzero diagonal entries, where $\mathbf{T}_i=\mathbf{I}_T\otimes\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_i$, satisfies the *block linear independence condition* if for any set of integer vectors $A\subseteq\mathbb{Z}^M$ with $|A|=L$, and $V\subseteq\mathbb{R}^{TL}$, we have

$$\dim\left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in A}\left(\left(\prod_{i=1}^{M}\mathbf{T}_i^{x_i}\right)V\right)\right)=\mathrm{sp}_T\left(V\right).$$

Almost all of the sets of diagonal matrices satisfy the block linear independence condition, as shown in the following lemma.

Lemma 14. *Let $\mathbf{T}_i\in\mathbb{R}^{TL\times TL}$ ($i=1,...,M$, $M\geq 2$) be diagonal matrices where $\mathbf{T}_i=\mathbf{I}_T\otimes\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_i$. Consider the LM-dimensional space containing all such $\{\mathbf{T}_i\}$ with the Lebesgue measure. Then $\{\mathbf{T}_i\}$ satisfies the block linear independence condition almost everywhere.*

Proof: Let $A=\{\mathbf{x}_1,...,\mathbf{x}_L\}$, and $\tilde{\Phi}\left(\mathbf{x}\right)=\prod_{i=1}^{M}\tilde{\mathbf{T}}_i^{x_i}$. As shown in Lemma 9, the matrix $\mathbf{X}=\left[\mathrm{diag}\left(\tilde{\Phi}\left(\mathbf{x}_1\right)\right)\cdots\mathrm{diag}\left(\tilde{\Phi}\left(\mathbf{x}_L\right)\right)\right]$ is full rank for any A almost everywhere. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in A}\left(\left(\prod_{i=1}^{M}\mathbf{T}_i^{x_i}\right)V\right) &= \sum_{i=1}^{L}\left(\mathbf{I}_T\otimes\tilde{\Phi}\left(\mathbf{x}_i\right)\right)V\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{L}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{L}\left(\mathbf{X}^{-1}\right)_{ji}\left(\mathbf{I}_T\otimes\tilde{\Phi}\left(\mathbf{x}_i\right)\right)\right)V\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{L}\left(\mathbf{I}_T\otimes\mathrm{diag}\left(\mathbf{e}_i\right)\right)V\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{L}\mathbf{P}_i^T\mathbf{P}_iV.\end{aligned}$$

Note that each of $\mathbf{P}_i^T\mathbf{P}_iV$ has disjoint support, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\dim\left(\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in A}\left(\left(\prod_{i=1}^{M}\mathbf{T}_i^{x_i}\right)V\right)\right) &= \dim\left(\sum_{i=1}^{L}\mathbf{P}_i^T\mathbf{P}_iV\right)\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{L}\dim\left(\mathbf{P}_i^T\mathbf{P}_iV\right)\\ &= \mathrm{sp}_T\left(V\right).\end{aligned}$$

■

We would now give a proof of Theorem 2.

Theorem 15. *Let $\mathbf{T}_1,\mathbf{T}_2\in\mathbb{R}^{TL\times TL}$ satisfy the block linear independence condition. Let $\epsilon>0$. Assume there exist vector subspace $V\subseteq\mathbb{R}^{TL}$ with $\dim V=D=\left(1-\epsilon\right)TL/2$ satisfying $\mathrm{sp}_{T,N}\left(V\right)\geq 2N-\epsilon TL$ for any N, and $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1}V,\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2}V\leq 2\epsilon TL$, then we have $L\geq\epsilon^{-2}/400$.*

Proof: Note that for any $n_1 \geq 0$, by Lemma 10,

$$\dim \mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} V \geq \dim V - n_1 \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V.$$

Let $W = \mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} V$. Substitute $n_1 = \left\lfloor \frac{D-N}{\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V} \right\rfloor$ for some N, we have $\dim W \geq N$, and therefore since $W \subseteq V$, by the definition of sparsity for V, $\mathrm{sp}_T(W) \geq \mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V)$. Also note that $\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} W \subseteq V$.

On the other hand, for any $n_2 \geq 0$, by Lemma 10,

$$\dim \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2} V \leq \dim V + n_2 \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V.$$

Substitute $n_2 = \left\lfloor \frac{\mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V) - 1 - D}{\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V} \right\rfloor$, we have $\dim \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2} V \leq \mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V) - 1$. Since $\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2} W \subseteq \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2} V$, we also have $\dim \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2} W \leq \mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V) - 1$.

Note that by the block linear independence condition, if $(n_1+1)(n_2+1) \geq L$, then $\dim \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}^{n_1} \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2}^{n_2} W \geq \mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V)$, which leads to a contradiction. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} L &> (n_1+1)(n_2+1) \\ &\geq \left(\frac{D-N}{\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V} \right) \left(\frac{\mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V) - D}{\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V} \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V \geq L^{-1} (D-N) \left(\mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V) - D \right).$$

Recall that $D = (1-\epsilon) TL/2$. Substitute $N = \left\lceil \frac{3-\epsilon}{8} TL \right\rceil$, by $\mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V) \geq 2N - \epsilon TL$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V &\geq L^{-1} \left(\frac{1-\epsilon}{2} TL - \frac{3-\epsilon}{8} TL - 1 \right) \left(\frac{3-\epsilon}{4} TL - \epsilon TL - \frac{1-\epsilon}{2} TL \right) \\ &= \frac{1-3\epsilon}{4} T \left(\frac{1-3\epsilon}{8} TL - 1 \right) \\ &\geq \frac{(1-3\epsilon)^2}{32} T^2 L - \frac{1}{4} T. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $2D = (1-\epsilon) TL < TL$, since both sides are integers, $2D \leq TL - 1$, $TL\epsilon \geq 1$. If $\epsilon \geq 1/20$, then $L \geq 1 \geq \frac{1}{400\epsilon^2}$.

If $\epsilon < 1/20$, then $TL \geq \epsilon^{-1} > 20$, $TL \geq 21$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V &\geq \frac{(1-3\epsilon)^2}{32} T^2 L - \frac{1}{4} T \\ &\geq \frac{(1-3/20)^2}{32} T^2 L - \frac{T^2 L}{84} \\ &= \frac{2869}{268800} T^2 L. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_i}(V) \leq 2\epsilon TL$. Hence

$$4\epsilon^2 T^2 L^2 \geq \frac{2869}{268800} T^2 L,$$

$$L \geq \frac{2869}{1075200\epsilon^2} \geq \frac{1}{400\epsilon^2}.$$

■

VIII. A Tighter Bound when K Grows

In this section, we would prove Theorem 3, which states

$$\mathrm{DoF} \leq \frac{K}{2} \left(1 - C \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{L}}, \frac{2^{(K-2)(K-3)/8}}{\sqrt{L}} \right\} \right),$$

where $C = 2^{-18}$. This implies that the gap decreases as $1/\sqrt[4]{L}$ when K grows as $\sqrt{\log L}$. We would only consider the block fading case in this section, since the fast fading case can be treated as a special case of block fading with $T = 1$.

First we would introduce the second order extension and contraction width.

Definition 16. (Second order extension and contraction width) For a subspace V and diagonal matrices $\mathbf{T}_1, \mathbf{T}_2$, define the second order extension width $\Delta^2_{\mathbf{T}_1,\mathbf{T}_2} V$ and contraction width $\nabla^2_{\mathbf{T}_1,\mathbf{T}_2} V$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^2_{\mathbf{T}_1,\mathbf{T}_2} V &= \dim\left(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2} V\right) - \dim\left(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1} V\right) - \dim\left(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2} V\right) + \dim V \\ &= \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1}\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_2} V - \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V, \\ \nabla^2_{\mathbf{T}_1,\mathbf{T}_2} V &= \dim\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_1}\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_2} V\right) - \dim\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_1} V\right) - \dim\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_2} V\right) + \dim V \\ &= \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V - \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1}\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_2} V.\end{aligned}$$

Note that we have the relation

$$\Delta^2_{\mathbf{T}_1,\mathbf{T}_2} V \leq \nabla^2_{\mathbf{T}_1,\mathbf{T}_2} V,$$

which can be seen from

$$\nabla^2_{\mathbf{T}_1,\mathbf{T}_2} V - \Delta^2_{\mathbf{T}_1,\mathbf{T}_2} = \dim\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_2}\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1} V\right) - \dim\left(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_1}\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_2} V\right) \geq 0.$$

Next we present a lemma, which is proved in a way similar to Theorem 11 and Theorem 15.

Lemma 17. *Let $\mathbf{T}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{TL\times TL}$ ($j = 1, ..., M$, $M \geq 2$) be diagonal matrices satisfying the block linear independence condition. Let $V_1, V_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{TL}$ be subspaces with $\dim V_1 = D_1$, $\dim V_2 = D_2$ satisfying $V_1 \subseteq \mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_3}\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_4}\cdots\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_M} V_2$, $\mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V_1) \geq 2N - \alpha$ for any N, where $\alpha > 0$, and $D_1 - D_2/2 - \alpha/2 \geq 4$. Then we have*

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V_1 \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V_2 \geq L^{-1} 2^{M-4} \left(D_1 - D_2/2 - \alpha/2\right)^2.$$

Proof: Note that for any $n_1 \geq 0$,

$$\dim \mathrm{c}^{n_1}_{\mathbf{T}_1} V_1 \geq D_1 - n_1 \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V_1.$$

Substitute $n_1 = \left\lfloor \frac{D_1 - N}{\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V_1} \right\rfloor$ for some N, we have $\dim \mathrm{c}^{n_1}_{\mathbf{T}_1} V_1 \geq N$. Let $W = \mathrm{c}^{n_1}_{\mathbf{T}_1} V_1$, then $\mathrm{e}^{n_1}_{\mathbf{T}_1}\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_3}\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_4}\cdots\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_M} W \subseteq V_2$.

On the other hand, for any $n_2 \geq 0$,

$$\dim \mathrm{e}^{n_2}_{\mathbf{T}_2} V_2 \leq D_2 + n_2 \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V_2.$$

Substitute $n_2 = \left\lfloor \frac{\mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V_1) - 1 - D_2}{\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V_2} \right\rfloor$, we have $\dim \mathrm{e}^{n_2}_{\mathbf{T}_2} V_2 \leq \mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V_1) - 1$. Let

$$\tilde{W} = \mathrm{e}^{n_1}_{\mathbf{T}_1}\mathrm{e}^{n_2}_{\mathbf{T}_2}\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_3}\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_4}\cdots\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_M} W.$$

Since $\tilde{W} \subseteq \mathrm{e}^{n_2}_{\mathbf{T}_2} V_2$, we also have $\dim \tilde{W} \leq \mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V_1) - 1$.

Note that by the block linear independence condition,

$$\begin{aligned} L &> 2^{M-2}(n_1+1)(n_2+1) \\ &\geq 2^{M-2}\left(\frac{D_1 - N}{\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V_1}\right)\left(\frac{\mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V) - D_2}{\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V_2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V_1 \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V_2 \geq L^{-1} 2^{M-2} (D_1 - N)\left(\mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V) - D_2\right).$$

Substitute $N = \left\lceil D_1/2 + D_2/4 + \alpha/4 \right\rceil$. By $\mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V_1) \geq 2N - \alpha$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1} V_1 \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2} V_2 &\geq L^{-1} 2^{M-3}\left(D_1 - D_2/2 - \alpha/2 - 2\right)\left(D_1 - D_2/2 - \alpha/2\right) \\ &\geq L^{-1} 2^{M-4}\left(D_1 - D_2/2 - \alpha/2\right)^2,\end{aligned}$$

since $D_1 - D_2/2 - \alpha/2 \geq 4$. ■

Now we prove a theorem which implies Theorem 3.

Theorem 18. *Let $\mathbf{T}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{TL\times TL}$ ($j = 1, ..., M$, $M \geq 2$) be diagonal matrices satisfying the block linear independence condition. If there exist a vector subspace $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{TL}$ with $\dim V = (1-\epsilon)TL/2$ satisfying $\mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V) \geq 2N - \epsilon TL$ for any N, and $\Delta_{T_j}(V) \leq 2\epsilon TL$ for any j, then we have*

$$L \geq 2^{-36}\epsilon^{-2} \min\left\{2^{M/4}, \epsilon^{-2}\right\},$$

Proof: If $\epsilon > 1/512$, then

$$\begin{aligned} L &\geq 1 \\ &\geq 2^{-36}\epsilon^{-4} \\ &\geq 2^{-36}\epsilon^{-2} \min\left\{2^{M/4}, \epsilon^{-2}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we would assume $\epsilon \le 1/512$ throughout the proof. Note that since $\dim V = (1-\epsilon)TL/2 < TL/2$, we have $(1-\epsilon)TL/2 \le (TL-1)/2$, and therefore $TL \ge \epsilon^{-1} \ge 512$.

Define $\bar{\Delta}W = \frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{M} \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_j} W$ to be the average alignment width of subspace W along all $\mathbf{T}_i$'s, and similarly define

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\Delta}^2_{\mathbf{T}} W &= \frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{M} \Delta^2_{\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}_j} W,\\ \bar{\nabla}^2_{\mathbf{T}} W &= \frac{1}{M}\sum_{j=1}^{M} \nabla^2_{\mathbf{T},\mathbf{T}_j} W.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\bar{\Delta}^2_{\mathbf{T}} W \le \bar{\nabla}^2_{\mathbf{T}} W$.

Intuitively, we would perform extensions (or contractions) on V repeatedly, using different $\mathbf{T}_i$'s each time, under the constraint that the extensions (or contractions) cannot increase $\bar{\Delta}V$ too much. Then we can invoke Lemma 17 to give a bound on L. We will define four functions

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{GW_e},\, \mathrm{GW_c} &: G(\mathbb{R}^{TL}) \times 2^{\{1,\dots,M\}} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0} \to G(\mathbb{R}^{TL}),\\ \mathrm{GS_e},\, \mathrm{GS_c} &: G(\mathbb{R}^{TL}) \times 2^{\{1,\dots,M\}} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0} \to 2^{\{1,\dots,M\}},\end{aligned}$$

where $G(\mathbb{R}^{TL})$ denotes the set of all subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^{TL}$, $2^{\{1,\dots,M\}}$ denotes the set of all subsets of $\{1,\dots,M\}$, and $\mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$ is the set of nonnegative integers. Intuitively, for $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{TL}$ and $S \subseteq \{1,\dots,M\}$, $\mathrm{GS_e}(W,S,0)$ would give a subset $\{k_1,k_2,\dots,k_n\} \subseteq S$ such that the subspace $\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S,0) = \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_1}} \cdots \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_n}} W$ is not too large. If this is possible, we can apply Lemma 17. Otherwise $\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S,0)$ would give a subspace with a smaller $\bar{\Delta}\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S,0)$ than W, so that the procedure can be repeated with $\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S,0)$ in place of W. The functions $\mathrm{GW_c}$ and $\mathrm{GS_c}$ serve similar functions, but use contractions instead of extensions.

We now formally define those functions recursively. Let $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{TL}$, $S \subseteq \{1,\dots,M\}$, $\ell \ge 0$. By Markov inequality, we have

$$\left|\left\{j \in \{1,\dots,M\} \,:\, \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_j} W \le 2\bar{\Delta}W\right\}\right| \ge M/2.$$

Hence if $|S| > M/2$, we can always find $k \in S$ such that $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_k} W \le 2\bar{\Delta}W$ by

$$k = \min\left\{j \in S \,:\, \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_j} W \le 2\bar{\Delta}W\right\}.$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned}&(\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S,\ell),\, \mathrm{GS_e}(W,S,\ell))\\ &= \begin{cases} (W,\emptyset) & \text{if } \dim W + \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_k} W \ge \frac{5}{8}TL \text{ or } |S| - \ell - 2 \le M/2 \text{ or } \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_k} W > 4\bar{\Delta}V\\ (\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_k} W,\, \{k\}) & \text{else if } \bar{\Delta}^2_{\mathbf{T}_k} W > \zeta\left(2^{\ell+1}-1\right)\\ \Big(\mathrm{GW_e}(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_k} W,\, S\backslash\{k\},\, \ell+1), & \text{otherwise.}\\ \quad \mathrm{GS_e}(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_k} W,\, S\backslash\{k\},\, \ell+1) \cup \{k\}\Big) & \end{cases}\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta &= \frac{\bar{\Delta}V}{2\eta},\\ \eta &= \min\left\{2^{M/8-2},\, \epsilon^{-1}/512\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that the condition "$|S| - \ell - 2 \le M/2$" ensures that

$$\begin{aligned}|S| - 2\left|\mathrm{GS_e}(W,S,0)\right| &\ge M/2,\\ \left|\mathrm{GS_e}(W,S,0)\right| &\le \frac{1}{2}|S| - \frac{1}{4}M.\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

We write $\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) = \mathrm{GW_e}(W,S,0)$, $\mathrm{GW_e}(W) = \mathrm{GW_e}(W,\{1,\dots,M\},0)$, and $\mathrm{GS_e}(W,S) = \mathrm{GS_e}(W,S,0)$, $\mathrm{GS_e}(W) = \mathrm{GS_e}(W,\{1,\dots,M\},0)$. Also define

$$\mathrm{GR_e}(W,S) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) = \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_1}} \cdots \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_n}} W\\ 2 & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}$$

where $\mathrm{GS_e}(W,S) = \{k_1,k_2,\dots,k_n\}$. Write $\mathrm{GR_e}(W) = \mathrm{GR_e}(W,\{1,\dots,M\})$. The value of $\mathrm{GR_e}(W)$ represents the result of the sequence of extensions and contractions. If it is 1, then we have found a sequence of extensions which is needed by Lemma 17. If it is 2, then it means we have hit the condition $\bar{\Delta}^2_{\mathbf{T}_k} W > \zeta\left(2^{\ell+1}-1\right)$ in (2), and although we have not found a useful sequence of extensions, the resultant subspace $\mathrm{GW_e}(W)$ has small $\bar{\Delta}\mathrm{GW_e}(W)$.

We will then prove some properties of those functions.

Claim 19. We have

$$|\dim \mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) - \dim W| \le 4\bar{\Delta}V \cdot |\mathrm{GS_e}(W,S)|\,, \tag{4}$$

and

$$\mathrm{sp}_{T,\, N+4\bar{\Delta}V\cdot|\mathrm{GS_e}(W)|}\left(\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S)\right) \ge \mathrm{sp}_{T,N}\left(W\right) \tag{5}$$

for any $N \ge 0$.

Proof: Note that all extensions of contractions in (2) are performed only when $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_k} W \le 4\bar{\Delta}V$, hence we have (4). Also (5) follows from (1). ∎

Claim 20. If $\mathrm{GR_e}(W,S) = 2$, then

$$\bar{\Delta}\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) \le \bar{\Delta}W - \zeta\,|\mathrm{GS_e}(W,S)|\,.$$

Proof: If $\mathrm{GR_e}(W,S) = 2$, then we know

$$\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) = \mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_n}} \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_{n-1}}} \cdots \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_1}} W$$

where $\mathrm{GS_e}(W,S) = \{k_1, ..., k_n\}$, $|\mathrm{GS_e}(W,S)| = n$. Hence by (2),

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\Delta}\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) &= \bar{\Delta}W - \bar{\nabla}^2_{\mathbf{T}_{k_n}}\left(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_{n-1}}} \cdots \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_1}} W\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \bar{\Delta}^2_{\mathbf{T}_{k_i}}\left(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_{i-1}}} \cdots \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_1}} W\right) \\
&\le \bar{\Delta}W - \bar{\Delta}^2_{\mathbf{T}_{k_n}}\left(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_{n-1}}} \cdots \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_1}} W\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \bar{\Delta}^2_{\mathbf{T}_{k_i}}\left(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_{i-1}}} \cdots \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_1}} W\right) \\
&\le \bar{\Delta}W - \zeta\left(2^{(n-1)+1} - 1\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \zeta\left(2^{(i-1)+1} - 1\right) \\
&= \bar{\Delta}W - \zeta n.
\end{aligned}$$

∎

Claim 21. If $\mathrm{GR_e}(W,S) = 1$, $|S| \ge \frac{3}{4}M$, $\bar{\Delta}W \le \bar{\Delta}V$ and $|\dim W - TL/2| \le TL/16$, then

$$|\mathrm{GS_e}(W,S)| \ge \log_2(\eta)\,. \tag{6}$$

Proof: If $\mathrm{GR_e}(W) = 1$, then we know

$$\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) = \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_n}} \cdots \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_1}} W$$

where $\mathrm{GS_e}(W,S) = \{k_1, ..., k_n\}$, $|\mathrm{GS_e}(W)| = n$. We would consider which condition in the first case of (2) is met.

If the condition "$|S| - \ell - 2 \le M/2$" is met, i.e., $|S| - 2\,|\mathrm{GS_e}(W)| - 2 \le M/2$, then

$$n \ge \frac{1}{2}\,|S| - \frac{1}{4}M - 2 \ge \frac{1}{8}M - 2 \ge \log_2(\eta).$$

If $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_k}\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) > 4\bar{\Delta}V$, then recall that $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_k}\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) \le 2\bar{\Delta}\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S)$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\Delta}\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) &= \bar{\Delta}W + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \bar{\Delta}^2_{\mathbf{T}_{k_i}}\left(\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_{i-1}}} \cdots \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_1}} W\right) \\
&\le \bar{\Delta}W + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \zeta\left(2^{(i-1)+1} - 1\right) \\
&\le \bar{\Delta}W + \zeta 2^{n+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
2^n &\ge \frac{1}{2}\zeta^{-1}\left(\bar{\Delta}\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) - \bar{\Delta}W\right) \\
&\ge \frac{1}{2}\zeta^{-1}\left(2\bar{\Delta}V - \bar{\Delta}V\right) \\
&= \eta.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\Delta_{\mathbf{T}_k}\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) \le 4\bar{\Delta}V$ and $\dim \mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) + \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_k}\mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) \ge \frac{5}{8}TL$, then since all extensions are performed only alignment width is not larger than $4\bar{\Delta}V$, we have

$$\dim \mathrm{GW_e}(W,S) \le \dim W + 4n\bar{\Delta}V.$$

Hence if $\epsilon \le 1/32$,

$$\begin{aligned} n &\ge \frac{\frac{5}{8}TL - \dim W}{4\bar{\Delta}V} - 1 \\ &\ge \frac{TL}{64\bar{\Delta}V} - 1 \\ &\ge \epsilon^{-1}/128 - 1 \\ &\ge \log_2(\epsilon^{-1}/512) \\ &\ge \log_2(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

■

The functions $\mathrm{GW_c}$, $\mathrm{GS_c}$ and $\mathrm{GR_c}$for contraction are defined similarly, with the roles of contractions and extensions swapped.

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathrm{GW_c}(W,S,\ell),\ \mathrm{GS_c}(W,S,\ell)) \\ &= \begin{cases} (W,\emptyset) & \text{if } \dim W - \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_k} W \le \frac{3}{8}TL \text{ or } |S| - \ell - 2 \le M/2 \text{ or } \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_k} W > 4\bar{\Delta}V \\ (\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_k} W,\ \{k\}) & \text{else if } -\bar{\nabla}^2_{\mathbf{T}_k} W > \zeta\left(2^{\ell+1}-1\right) \\ \Big(\mathrm{GW_c}(\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_k} W,\ S\backslash\{k\},\ell+1), & \text{otherwise,} \\ \quad \mathrm{GS_c}(\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_k} W,\ S\backslash\{k\},\ell+1)\cup\{k\}\Big) & \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

$$\mathrm{GR_c}(W,S) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathrm{GW_c}(W,S) = \mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_1}} \cdots \mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_n}} W \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that Claim 19, 20 and 21 also hold for $\mathrm{GW_c}$, $\mathrm{GS_c}$ and $\mathrm{GR_c}$.

We now use those functions to describe the construction. Define subspaces W_i and subsets $S_i \subseteq \{1,...,M\}$ recursively by $W_0 = V$,

$$(W_{i+1}, S_{i+1}) = \begin{cases} (\mathrm{GW_e}(W_i),\ \mathrm{GS_e}(W_i)) & \text{if } \mathrm{GR_e}(W_i) = 2 \\ \Big(\mathrm{GW_c}(W_i, \{1,...,M\}\backslash \mathrm{GS_e}(W_i)), & \text{if } \mathrm{GR_e}(W_i) = 1 \text{ and } \mathrm{GR_c}(W_i, \{1,...,M\}\backslash \mathrm{GS_e}(W_i)) = 2. \\ \quad \mathrm{GS_c}(W_i, \{1,...,M\}\backslash \mathrm{GS_e}(W_i))\Big) & \end{cases}$$

Note that $|S_i| \ge 1$. The recursive definition ends when none of the cases hold, i.e., it ends at W_m where $\mathrm{GR_e}(W_m) = \mathrm{GR_c}(W_m, \{1,...,M\}\backslash \mathrm{GS_e}(W_m)) = 1$. By Claim 20, for any n,

$$0 \le \bar{\Delta} W_n \le \bar{\Delta} V - \zeta \sum_{i=1}^{n} |S_i| .$$

Hence the recursive definition always ends at a finite m, and also

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{m} |S_i| &\le \zeta^{-1} \bar{\Delta} V \\ &\le 2\eta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore by Claim 19, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\dim W_m - \dim V| &\le 4\bar{\Delta}V \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{m} |S_i| \\ &\le 8\bar{\Delta}V \cdot \eta \\ &\le 8\left(2\epsilon TL\right) \cdot \epsilon^{-1}/512 \\ &= TL/32. \end{aligned}$$

Hence when $\epsilon \le 1/32$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\dim W_m - TL/2| &\le |\dim W_m - \dim V| + |\dim V - TL/2| \\ &\le TL/16. \end{aligned}$$

Also note that by (3),

$$|\mathrm{GS_e}(W_m)| \le \frac{1}{4}M,$$

$$|\{1,...,M\}\setminus \mathrm{GS_e}(W_m)| \geq \frac{3}{4}M.$$

By Claim 21,

$$|\mathrm{GS_e}(W_m)|\,,\ |\mathrm{GS_c}(W_m, \{1,...,M\}\setminus \mathrm{GS_e}(W_m))| \geq \log_2(\eta)\,.$$

Let $\mathrm{GS_c}(W_m, \{1,...,M\}\setminus \mathrm{GS_e}(W_m)) = \{k_{1,1},...,k_{1,n_1}\}$ and $\mathrm{GS_e}(W_m) = \{k_{2,1},...,k_{2,n_2}\}$, $n_1, n_2 \geq \log_2(\eta)$. Let $V_1 = \mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_{1,2}}}\cdots\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_{1,n_1}}} W_m$ and $V_2 = \mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_{2,2}}}\cdots\mathrm{e}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_{2,n_2}}} W_m$, then

$$V_1 \subseteq \mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_{1,2}}}\cdots\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_{1,n_1}}}\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_{2,2}}}\cdots\mathrm{c}_{\mathbf{T}_{k_{2,n_2}}} V_2.$$

By (2),

$$|\dim V_1 - TL/2|\,,\ |\dim V_2 - TL/2| \leq TL/8. \tag{8}$$

Using Claim 19 again,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{sp}_{T,\,N+TL/32}(V_1) &\geq \mathrm{sp}_{T,\,N+TL/32}(W_m)\\ &\geq \mathrm{sp}_{T,\,N+8\bar{\Delta}V\cdot\eta}(W_m)\\ &\geq \mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V)\end{aligned}$$

for all $N \geq 0$. Since $\mathrm{sp}_{T,N}(V) \geq 2N - \epsilon TL$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{sp}_{T,\,N}(V_1) &\geq \mathrm{sp}_{T,\,N-TL/32}(V)\\ &\geq 2N - \left(\epsilon + \frac{1}{16}\right)TL\end{aligned}$$

for all $N \geq 0$.

We would invoke Lemma 17 with $\alpha := (\epsilon + 1/16)\,TL$, $\mathbf{T}_1 := \mathbf{T}_{k_{1,1}}$, $\mathbf{T}_2 := \mathbf{T}_{k_{2,2}}$, $\{\mathbf{T}_i\}_{i\geq 3} := \left\{\mathbf{T}_{k_{1,2}},...,\mathbf{T}_{k_{1,n_1}},\mathbf{T}_{k_{2,2}},...,\mathbf{T}_{k_{2,n_2}}\right\}$. To check the condition of the lemma, note that (8) gives $\dim V_1 - \dim V_2/2 \geq TL/16$, and therefore by $\epsilon \leq 1/32$ and $TL \geq 512$,

$$\begin{aligned}\dim V_1 - \dim V_2/2 - \alpha/2 &\geq TL/16 - (\epsilon/2 + 1/32)\,TL\\ &\geq TL/64\\ &\geq 4.\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}(2\epsilon TL)^2 \geq \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_1}V_1 \cdot \Delta_{\mathbf{T}_2}V_2 &\geq L^{-1}2^{n_1+n_2-4}\left(\dim V_1 - \dim V_2/2 - \alpha/2\right)^2\\ &\geq L^{-1}2^{2\log_2(\eta)-4}(TL/64)^2\\ &= 2^{-16}\eta^2T^2L,\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}L &\geq 2^{-18}\epsilon^{-2}\eta^2\\ &= 2^{-18}\epsilon^{-2}\left(\min\left\{2^{M/8-2},\,\epsilon^{-1}/512\right\}\right)^2\\ &\geq 2^{-36}\epsilon^{-2}\min\left\{2^{M/4},\,\epsilon^{-2}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

■

IX. Conclusion

In this paper, we derived upper bounds on the degrees of freedom achievable with vector space interference alignment strategies over the K-user interference channel as a function of the available channel diversity (the number of independently fading parallel channels). Our results show that the channel diversity poses a fundamental limit on the efficiency of interference alignment. However, there is still a large gap between the derived upper bounds and the achievable strategies, even in the scaling sense. Closing this gap remains as an important problem which will determine the promise of interference alignment strategies in practical systems.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Maddah-Ali, A. Motahari, and A. Khandani, "Signaling over mimo multi-base systems: Combination of multi-access and broadcast schemes," in *Information Theory, 2006 IEEE International Symposium on*, 2006, pp. 2104–2108.

[2] V. Cadambe and S. A. Jafar, "Interference alignment and degrees of freedom of the K-user interference channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 3425–3441, Aug. 2008.

[3] A. Ozgur and D. Tse, "Achieving linear scaling with interference alignment," in *Information Theory, 2009. ISIT 2009. IEEE International Symposium on*, 2009, pp. 1754 – 1758.

[4] G. Bresler and D. Tse, "3 user interference channel: Degrees of freedom as a function of channel diversity," in *Communication, Control, and Computing, 2009. Allerton 2009. 47th Annual Allerton Conference on*, 2009, pp. 265–271.

[5] V. Cadambe, S. Jafar, and C. Wang, "Interference alignment with asymmetric complex signaling -settling the host-madsen-nosratinia conjecture," *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4552–4565, 2010.

[6] K. Gomadam, V. Cadambe, and S. Jafar, "Approaching the capacity of wireless networks through distributed interference alignment," in *IEEE GLOBECOM*, 2008, pp. 1–6.

[7] C. Yetis, T. Gou, S. Jafar, and A. Kayran, "On feasibility of interference alignment in mimo interference networks," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 58, no. 9, pp. 4552–4565, 2010.

[8] G. Bresler, C. D., and D. Tse, "Geometry of the 3-user mimo interference channel," in *Communication, Control, and Computing, 2009. Allerton 2009. 47th Annual Allerton Conference on*, 2011.

[9] L. G. M. Razaviyayn and Z. Luo., "On the degrees of freedom achievable through interference alignment in a mimo interference channel," in *arXiv:1104.0992v1*, 2011.

[10] G. Bresler, C. D., and D. Tse, "Settling the feasibility of interference alignment for the MIMO interference channel: The symmetric square case," in *arXiv:1104.0888*, 2011.